ATTACHMENT 2

Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan
For
The Colorado River Basin Region
To Correct or Update Language, Tables, and Figures

This amendment revises Chapters 1, 3, 4, and 5 of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board (Basin Plan). The amendment updates outdated information and water quality objective tables; corrects typographical errors; clarifies ambiguities; and makes the Basin Plan consistent with laws and regulations adopted subsequent to 1994 when the Basin Plan was first adopted. Revisions to Chapters 1, 3, 4, and 5 are shown below in underlined and strikethrough format. Proposed additions are denoted by underlined text, proposed deletions are denoted by ~~strikethrough text~~. Pages inside brackets "[ ]" refer to pages in the Basin Plan.

AMENDMENT

1. **To cover page of Basin Plan, change revision date to current revision date as shown:**

WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
COLORADO RIVER BASIN - REGION 7
~~Includes Amendments Adopted by the Regional Board through June 2006~~
Revised on [Date of OAL Approval]

2. **Replace Table of Contents as shown:**

~~TABLE OF CONTENTS~~

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3. "List of Tables" and "List of Figures"

Add the "List of Tables", and "List of Figures" shown below, after the "Table of Contents".

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 2 – BENEFICIAL USES

CHAPTER 4 - IMPLEMENTATION

CHAPTER 6 - SURVEILLANCE, MONITORING AND WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1. "**VI. PLANNING AREAS**", [page 1-9]

Revise figure reference label at the end of the first paragraph as indicated:

For planning and reporting purposes, the Region has been divided into the following seven major planning areas on the basis of different economic and hydrologic characteristics ~~(Plate 1-1):~~ (Figure 1-1):

2. **"VI. PLANNING AREAS"**, [page 1-10]

Revise figure reference label at the top of the page as indicated:

~~Plate 1-1.~~ Figure 1-1. Colorado River Basin Planning Areas~~.~~

3. **"2. Ground Water Hydrology", [page 1-12].**

Insert the new paragraph below discussing ground water recharge projects in the Coachella Valley Ground Water Basin as a fifth (i.e., last) paragraph:

Efforts to recharge the ground water basin in the Coachella Valley began in 1919 when the Coachella Valley County Water District constructed facilities to capture natural flows from the Whitewater River channel to recharge the upper portion of the Whitewater River Subbasin. In 1973, the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) and Desert Water Agency (DWA) began importing Colorado River water to the Whitewater recharge facility. The imported water was obtained from Metropolitan Water District of Southern California via the Colorado River Aqueduct in exchange for State Water Project water, for the purpose of increasing ground water recharge in the upper portion of the Whitewater River Subbasin. In 2002, CVWD and DWA completed construction of the Mission Creek recharge facility and began recharging the Mission Creek Subbasin with imported Colorado River water. Colorado River water transported by the Coachella Canal is also used by CVWD to recharge the lower portion of the Whitewater River Subbasin at two sites in the Eastern Coachella Valley. Recharge at the pilot Dike 4 recharge facility located in La Quinta began in 1997 and in 2009, recharge began at the full-scale Thomas E. Levy Groundwater Replenishment facility also at this location. Recharge at the pilot Martinez Canyon recharge facility located near the community of Oasis began in 2005. Ground water producers throughout the Coachella Valley are cooperating partners in these ground water recharge projects, which are funded by the replenishment assessment programs.

CHAPTER 3 - WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

1. "**D. TEMPERATURE**", [page 3-2]

Revise the first paragraph to read as follows:

The natural receiving water temperature of surface waters shall not be altered by discharges of wastewater ~~waste~~ unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Board that such alteration in temperature does not adversely affect beneficial uses.

2. "**M. RADIOACTIVITY**", page [3-3]

Revise the second paragraph to read as follows:

Waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of radionuclides in excess of the limits specified in ~~the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 5, Section 64443, as listed below:~~ Tables 64442 and 64443 of Sections 64442 and 64443, respectively, of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan. This incorporation by reference is prospective, including future revisions to the incorporated provisions as the revisions take effect.

3. "**M. RADIOACTIVITY**", page [3-3]

Correct typographical error for unit of measure for radioactivity in MCL table as indicated:

Constituent	Maximum Contaminant Level, ~~pci/L~~ pCi/L
Combined Radium-226 and Radium-228	5
Gross Alpha ~~P~~particle activity ~~(including Radium-226 but~~ (excluding Radon and Uranium)	15
Tritium	20,000 *
Strontium-90	8 **
~~Gross Beta particle activity~~	~~50~~
Beta / photon emitters	4 MREM ***
Uranium	20

* Equivalent to 4 millirem / year dose to total body
** Equivalent to 4 millirem / year dose to bone marrow
*** 4 millirem / year annual dose equivalent to the total body or any internal organ

4. "N. CHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS", [page 3-4]

Revise the last sentence in the first paragraph to read as follows:

Waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the ~~limits specified below:~~ maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) based upon drinking water standards specified in the following provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan: Table 64431-A of Section 64431 (Inorganic Chemicals), Table 64444-A of Section 64444 (Organic Chemicals), and Table 64678-A of Section 64678 (Determination of Exceedances of Lead and Copper Action Levels). This incorporation is prospective, including future revisions to the incorporated provisions as the revisions take effect. The Regional Board acknowledges that specific treatment requirements are imposed by state and federal drinking water regulations on the consumption of surface waters under specific circumstances. To protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs.

5. "N. CHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS", [page 3-4]

Update table labeled "Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for Organic and Inorganic Chemicals" as shown below, and remove table labeled "Limiting Concentrations of Fluoride":

Maximum Contaminant Levels* (MCLs) for Organic and Inorganic Chemicals

Inorganic Chemical Constituents	MCL*, mg/L
Arsenic	~~0.05~~ 0.01
Barium	1.0
Cadmium	~~0.010~~ 0.005
Chromium	0.05
Fluoride	2.0
Lead	~~0.005~~ 0.015 **
Mercury	0.002
Nitrate (as ~~nitrogen~~NO_3)	45.0
Nitrate+Nitrite (sum as nitrogen)	10.0
Selenium	~~0.01~~ 0.05
Silver	~~05~~ 0.10

Organic Chemical Constituents	MCL*, mg/L
(a) Chlorinated Hydrocarbons	
Endrin	0.002
Lindane	~~0.004~~ 0.0002
Methoxychlor	~~0.1~~ 0.03
Toxaphene	~~0.005~~ 0.003

(b) Chlorophenoxys

2,4-D……..……..……~~0.1~~ 0.07

2,4,5-TP Silvex……..……~~0.01~~ 0.05

** Limit given is "Action Level". USEPA's Lead and Copper Rule requires drinking water systems to monitor for lead from customer taps. If ten percent of the homes tested have lead levels greater than the action level of 15 ppb, the system must increase monitoring, undertake additional efforts to control corrosion, and inform the public. For each monitoring period, a system (or the state) must calculate the lead level at the 90th percentile of homes monitored.

~~Limiting Concentrations of Fluoride~~

~~Annual Average of Maximum Daily Air Temperature~~ ~~Fluoride Concentrations mg/l~~

~~Degrees Fahrenheit~~	~~Degrees Celsius~~	~~Lower*~~	~~Optimum~~	~~Upper*~~	~~MCL~~
~~below 53.8~~	~~below 12.1~~	~~0.9~~	~~1.2~~	~~1.7~~	~~2.4~~
~~53.8 to 58.3~~	~~12.1 to 14.6~~	~~0.8~~	~~1.1~~	~~1.5~~	~~2.2~~
~~58.4 to 63.8~~	~~14.7 to 17.6~~	~~0.8~~	~~1.0~~	~~1.3~~	~~2.0~~
~~63.9 to 70.6~~	~~17.7 to 21.4~~	~~0.7~~	~~0.9~~	~~1.2~~	~~1.8~~
~~70.7 to 79.2~~	~~21.5 to 26.2~~	~~0.7~~	~~0.8~~	~~1.0~~	~~1.6~~
~~79.3 to 90.5~~	~~26.3 to 32.5~~	~~0.6~~	~~0.7~~	~~0.8~~	~~1.4~~

6. "B. BACTERIOLOGICAL QUALITY", [page 3-8]

Revise citation for California Code of Regulations to read as follows:

In ground waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN), the concentration of coliform organisms shall not exceed the limits specified in ~~California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 3~~ Section 64426.1 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.

7. "C. CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL QUALITY", [page 3-8]

Revise citation for California Code of Regulations to read as follows:

Ground waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the ~~limits specified in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 4, Section 64435, Tables 2, 3, and 4 as a result of human activity.~~ maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in the following provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan: Table 64431-A of Section 64431 (Inorganic Chemicals), Table 64444-A of Section 64444 (Organic Chemicals), and Table 64678-A of Section 64678 (Determination of Exceedances of Lead and Copper Action Levels). This incorporation is prospective, including

future revisions to the incorporated provisions as the revisions take effect. The Regional Board acknowledges that specific treatment requirements are imposed by state and federal drinking water regulations on the consumption of surface waters under specific circumstances. To protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs.

8. "E. RADIOACTIVITY", [page 3-8]

Revise citation for California Code of Regulations to read as follows**:**

Ground water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain radioactive material in excess of the ~~limits specified in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 5, Sections 64441 and 64443. The limits contained in Section 64443 are included under item "II. M. Radioactivity," in this Chapter.~~ maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in Tables 64442 and 64443 of Sections 64442 and 64443, respectively, of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), which are incorporated by reference into this plan. This incorporation by reference is prospective, including future revisions to the incorporated provisions as the revisions take effect.

CHAPTER 4 - IMPLEMENTATION

1. Revise labels for the Tables and Figures below as indicated:

a. [Page 4-15]:
Table ~~A-1~~ 4-2: ~~New River Pathogen TMDL Elements~~ NEW RIVER PATHOGEN TMDL ELEMENTS

b. [Page 4-18]:
Table ~~A-2.~~ 4-3: ~~Schedule for Draft Revised NPDES Permits~~ SCHEDULE FOR DRAFT REVISED NPDES PERMITS

c. [Page 4-20]:
Table ~~B-1~~ 4-4: ~~Alamo River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL Elements[1] (continued)~~ ALAMO RIVER SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION TMDL ELEMENTS[1]

d. [Page 4-23]:
Table ~~B-1A[1]~~ 4-5: ~~Waste Load Allocations for Point Sources in the Alamo River Watershed~~ WASTE LOAD ALLOCATIONS FOR POINT SOURCES IN THE ALAMO RIVER WATERSHED

e. [Page 4-24]:
Table ~~B-2~~ 4-6: ~~Interim Numeric Targets for Attainment of the TMDL[1]~~ INTERIM NUMERIC TARGETS FOR THE ATTAINMENT OF THE SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION TMDL[1] FOR THE ALAMO RIVER

f. [Page 4-24]:
Table ~~C-1~~ 4-7: ~~New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL Elements~~ NEW RIVER SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION TMDL ELEMENTS

g. [Page 4-28]:
Table ~~C-2~~ 4-8: ~~Interim Numeric Targets for Attainment of the TMDL~~ INTERIM NUMERIC TARGETS FOR ATTAINMENT OF THE SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION TMDL FOR THE NEW RIVER

h. [Page 4-29]:
Figure ~~D-1~~ 4-1: ~~Drains (Niland 2, P, and Pumice and Their Tributary Drains) for Which Allocations Have Been Specified in This TMDL~~ DRAINS (NILAND 2, P, AND PUMICE, AND THEIR TRIBUTARY DRAINS) FOR WHICH ALLOCATIONS HAVE BEEN SPECIFIED IN THIS TMDL

i. [Page 4-29]:
Table ~~D-1~~ 4-9: ~~Imperial Valley Drains (Niland 2, P, and Pumice) Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL Elements~~ IMPERIAL VALLEY DRAINS (NILAND 2, P, AND PUMICE) SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION TMDL ELEMENTS

j. [Page 4-32]:
Table ~~D-2~~ 4-10: ~~Interim Numeric Targets for Attainment of the TMDL~~ INTERIM NUMERIC TARGETS FOR ATTAINMENT OF THE SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION TMDL FOR IMPERIAL VALLEY DRAINS

k. [Page 4-33]:
Table ~~E-1~~ 4-11: ~~Sediment Control Program Due Dates~~ SEDIMENT CONTROL PROGRAM DUE DATES

l. [Page 4-34]:
Table ~~E-2~~ 4-12: ~~Revised DWQIP Due Dates~~ REVISED DWQIP DUE DATES

m. [Page 4-35]:
Table ~~E-3~~ 4-13: ~~IID Submission of Data on Agricultural Dischargers Due Dates~~ IID SUBMISSION OF DATA ON AGRICULTURAL DISCHARGERS DUE DATES

n. [Page 4-35]:
Table ~~E-4~~ 4-14: ~~Technical Report Due Dates~~ TECHNICAL REPORT DUE DATES

o. [Page 4-39]:
Table ~~E-5~~ 4-15: ~~Letter Issue Due Dates~~ LETTER ISSUE DUE DATES

p. [Page 4-39]:
Table ~~E-6~~ 4-16: ~~List of Program Participants Due Dates~~ LIST OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS DUE DATES

q. [Page 4-39]:
Table ~~E-7~~ 4-17: ~~ICFB Watershed Program Plan Due Dates~~ ICBF WATERSHED PROGRAM PLAN DUE DATES

r. [Page 4-39]:
Table ~~E-8~~ 4-18: ~~Tracking Implementation Plan Due Dates~~ TRACKING IMPLEMENTATION PLAN DUE DATES

s. [Page 4-41]:
Table ~~F-1~~ 4-19: ~~New River at the International Boundary Trash TMDL Elements~~ NEW RIVER AT THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY TRASH TMDL ELEMENTS

t. [Page 4-42]:
Table ~~F-2~~ 4-20: ~~Time Schedule for Implementation Plan Phases and Numeric Targets for Trash in the New River at the International Boundary~~ TIME SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PHASES AND NUMERIC TARGETS FOR TRASH IN THE NEW RIVER AT THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY

u. [Page 4-42]:
Table ~~F-3~~ 4-21: ~~Requested Actions for Third Party Cooperating Agencies and Organizations~~ REQUESTED ACTIONS FOR THIRD PARTY COOPERATING AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

v. [Page 4-43]:

Table ~~F-4~~ 4-22: ~~Requested Trash Reduction Actions for the USIBWC and USEPA~~ REQUESTED TRASH REDUCTION ACTIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION (USIBWC) AND USEPA

w. [Page 4-44]:
Table ~~F-5~~ 4-23: ~~Requested Monitoring Actions for the USIBWC and USEPA~~ REQUESTED MONITORING ACTIONS FOR THE USIBWC AND USEPA

x. [Page 4-45]:
Table ~~F-6~~ 4-24: ~~TMDL Review Schedule~~ TMDL REVIEW SCHEDULE

2. "I. INTRODUCTION", [page 4-1]

Correct misspelling in heading of section A. as follows:

A. REGIONAL BOARD GOALS AND MANAGEMENT ~~PRINCIPALS~~ PRINCIPLES

3. "F. STORMWATER", [page 4-4]

a. Revise text in the second bullet of the first paragraph to read as follows:

- construction activities that disturb ~~five~~ one or more acres of land; and

b. Delete paragraph four and five, and add text thereafter as indicated below:

~~Municipalities with over 100,000 persons who own and operate stormwater sewer systems are required to obtain municipal NPDES stormwater permits. Although there are currently no individual municipalities that exceed this population in this region, the Coachella Valley area contains approximately 250,000 persons. Therefore, the cities and other authorities in the Coachella Valley who own and operate storm drainage systems have been designated by the Regional Board as municipalities required to have a municipal NPDES stormwater permit. The cities located in the Coachella Valley, along with the County of Riverside, Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and the Coachella Valley Water District, have formed a group to apply as co-applicants for a single areawide municipal NPDES stormwater permit. Part 1 of their application was submitted in May 1992. Part 2 is due in May 1994. The permit should be issued by January 1995. Other municipalities may be required to have a permit as their populations grow or as smaller municipalities are phased into the regulations.~~

~~Caltrans has filed an application to discharge stormwater from their highways in the Region. This permit is expected to be issued by January 1994."~~

The Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program regulates storm water discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s). MS4 permits, as described in the State

Water Resources Control Board's web site (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal.shtml), were issued in two phases.

Under Phase I, which started in 1990, the nine Regional Boards adopted NPDES storm water permits for medium municipalities with populations between 100,000 and 250,000 people, and for large municipalities with populations of 250,000 people or more. On March 14, 1991, the Executive Officer of the Colorado River Basin Regional Board designated the Whitewater River region as an area required to have a Phase I NPDES MS4 permit. The first MS4 permit (Order No. 96-015, NPDES No. CAS 617002) expired on May 22, 2001. The permit was renewed by Regional Board Order No. 01-077 (NPDES No. CAS617002) on September 5, 2001.

The County of Riverside and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, in cooperation with the Coachella Valley Water District and incorporated cities, including the cities of Banning, Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs and Rancho Mirage (Joint Cities), jointly submitted an NPDES application on March 9, 2006. Along with the application, the Joint Cities submitted a report of waste discharge for re-issuance of the MS4 permit to carry out the activities, regional compliance programs, and responsibilities prescribed in the previously issued NPDES permit (Order No. 01-077). The final MS4 permit for the Joint Cities was adopted by the Regional Board (Order No. R7-2008-0001) on May 21, 2008.

As part of Phase II, the State Board adopted a general permit for the discharge of storm water from small MS4s (WQ Order No. 2003-0005-DWQ) to provide permit coverage for smaller municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which are government facilities such as military bases, public school campuses, and prison and hospital complexes. In March 2009, the County of Imperial and the cities of El Centro, Imperial, Brawley, and Calexico enrolled in the Small MS4 program. Their permit can be viewed at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml/.

Discharges of storm water runoff from lands owned by Caltrans are currently regulated under a separate NPDES permit (Order No. 99-06-DWQ: NPDES No. CAS 000003) issued by the State Board. The complete description of this program can be found at the following link: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/caltrans.shtml.

4. "**H. SEPTIC SYSTEMS**", [page 4-5]

Revise text and format for section titled "**H. SEPTIC SYSTEMS**" as follows:

H. SEPTIC SYSTEMS

1. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Section 13224, Article 2, Chapter 4 of the California Water Code, the Colorado River Basin Region may issue policy statements relating to any water quality matter within its

jurisdiction. Septic systems (all on-site wastewater treatment systems) have the potential to degrade the water within the Region's jurisdiction if improperly used. For this reason, the Regional Board has established guidelines and a general permit for such systems.

The 1979 "Guidelines for Sewage Disposal ~~From~~ from Land Developments" (herein referred to as the guidelines) describe appropriate use of septic tank systems. Also discussed is the role which the county governments have in the placement and allowance of these systems. The guidelines describe what types of discharges need Waste Discharge Requirements and what types of discharges qualify for a waiver under Water Code Sections 13260 and 13269, respectively. To eliminate confusion, systems which should adhere to the guidelines are also described. However, the bulk of the guidelines describe minimum design criteria where septic systems can be placed to protect groundwater quality.

The guidelines are reviewed and revised as necessary. At this time some local governments in the Region have prohibitions on septic systems.

Since January 1993, the Regional Board has required all new vehicle maintenance facilities which use septic systems as a wastewater disposal method to file for a general discharge permit. It has been shown that some septic systems for auto maintenance facilities have been contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons. The general permit describes appropriate designs for septic systems used at vehicle maintenance shops and requires analysis, monitoring and reporting. By requiring these items, it is anticipated that pollution from these systems can be identified and stopped prior to extensive contamination.

2. Conditional Discharge Prohibitions For Septic Systems

A. Cathedral City Cove

On and after January 1, 2012, the discharge of wastewater into the ground through the use of individual subsurface disposal systems in the Cove area of Cathedral City in Riverside County is prohibited. Cathedral City Cove is that area of the city bound to the south by Cathedral City city limits as of January 1, 2012, to the east by the East Cathedral Canyon Channel, to the west by the West Cathedral Canyon Channel, and to the north east by the extension of the West Cathedral Canyon Channel, as depicted in the USGS Cathedral City Quad Map photo-revised in 1981. On October 17, 2002, the State Board approved a $2,809,000.00 grant to the city of Cathedral City for Cove area septic system elimination.

Cathedral City Cove - Reports

~~On October 17, 2002, the State Water Resources Control Board approved a $2,809,000.00 grant to the city of Cathedral City for Cove area septic system elimination. Pursuant to Section 13225 of the Water Code, by May 21, 2004 the City of Cathedral City shall submit to the Regional Board a report describing an implementation plan to comply with the January 1, 2012 prohibition date. Thereafter, the city shall submit annual reports to the Regional Board regarding any actions taken by the city of Cathedral City or any other person or entity in order to achieve compliance by January 1, 2012.~~

B. Mission Creek or Desert Hot Springs Aquifers

5. "A. AGRICULTURE", [page 4-7]

Revise and format text in section titled "**A. AGRICULTURE"** as follows:

A. AGRICULTURE

1. Introduction

Agricultural wastewater discharges, primarily irrigation return flows, constitute the largest volume of pollution entering surface waters in this Region. The agricultural drains/drain systems in this Region support significant beneficial uses as identified in Chapter 2 of this Plan. In an effort to protect and enhance these uses, the Regional Board adopted the "Agricultural Drainage Management (ADM) Report for the Colorado River Basin Region" in March 1992. This report established priorities for dealing with the drain systems based on a watershed approach. Drainage entities (e.g. water districts), including Imperial Irrigation District, Coachella Valley Water District, and Palo Verde Irrigation District, were identified in each of four watersheds, and the Regional Board will work closely with these entities to implement agricultural pollution controls.

The preferred approach toward addressing nonpoint source pollution is to deal with the problem on a watershed basis. The Salton Sea Transboundary Watershed has been identified as this Region's highest priority for control of agricultural pollution, based mainly on its relatively large size, the beneficial uses of waters in the watershed, the volume of discharge, and the severity of water quality degradation. California's 1998 Unified Watershed Assessment identified the Salton Sea Transboundary Watershed as a Category 1 (impaired) watershed.

The effectiveness over time of agricultural pollution controls is much more likely if all involved parties (e.g. farmers, local officials, the public) are informed of these activities and play a role in their development and implementation. In recognition of this, the state and federal nonpoint source programs contain significant outreach and educational components. In addition to working with the identified drainage entities, the Regional Board will continue to work with local Resource Conservation Districts, the U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service, the State Department of Pesticide Regulation, the State Department of Food and Agriculture, County Agricultural Commissioners, college and university agricultural extension services, local Farm Bureaus, and stakeholder groups. The Regional Board also has the responsibility of coordinating and overseeing implementation of federal and state grants and loans programs that provide resources to local entities for control of nonpoint source pollution. The Regional Board will provide technical and educational assistance on pollution control as requested by local groups and will collect and make available information on successful pollution control activities in other regions and other states.

2. Conditional Discharge Prohibitions For Agriculture

A. Imperial Valley Sedimentation/Siltation

A prohibition of sediment/silt discharge is hereby established for the Imperial Valley, including the Alamo River, New River, all Imperial Valley Drains, and their tributaries. Specifically, beginning three months after USEPA approval, the direct or indirect discharge of sediment into the Imperial Valley is prohibited, unless:

The Discharger is:

- In compliance with applicable Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL(s), including implementation provisions (e.g., Discharger is in good standing with the ICFB Watershed Program or has a Drain Water Quality Monitoring Plan (DWQMP) approved by the Executive Officer); or

- Has a monitoring and surveillance program approved by the Executive Officer that demonstrates that discharges of sediment/silt into the aforementioned waters do not violate or contribute to a violation of the TMDL(s), the anti-degradation policy (State Board Resolution No. 68-16), or water quality objectives; or

- Is covered by Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) or a Waiver of WDRs that applies to the discharge.

TMDL compliance groups have formed to address issues regarding wastewater discharge from irrigated lands to waters of the State. Individual Dischargers are not required by the Regional Board to join in TMDL compliance groups. Individual Dischargers who choose not to participate in TMDL compliance groups must file a Report of Waste Discharge for general or individual Waste Discharge Requirements. Compliance with the prohibition will be determined with respect to each individual Discharger, whether or not the Discharger is a member of a compliance group. The intent of this prohibition is to control to the degree practicable sediment/silt discharges from irrigated lands in amounts that violate or contribute to a violation of state water quality standards.

6. "**A. NEW RIVER POLLUTION BY MEXICO**", [page 4-11]:

In the section titled "**A. NEW RIVER POLLUTION BY MEXICO**" beginning on page 4-8 of the Basin Plan, revise the paragraph on page 4-11 that begins "The long term strategy consists of……" to read as indicated below, and add text thereafter:

The long-term strategy consists of a series of sewage infrastructure projects for Mexicali I and Mexicali II service areas to address New River pollution. The Mexicali I projects consist of the replacement/rehabilitation of about 44,000 feet of sewage pipes, rehabilitation of sewage pump stations, and expansion of the Mexicali I

wastewater treatment plant to 30 mgd. The Mexicali II projects entail the construction of a new 20-mgd wastewater treatment plant (a.k.a. Mexicali II WWTP), the sewage Pumping Plant No. 4 for the new WWTP, installation of telemetry equipment for the WWTP and pumping plants, construction of 31,170 feet of discharge forcemain[2] for Pumping Plant No. 4, construction/rehabilitation of about 96,000 feet of sewer lines, and rehabilitation of two sewage lift stations. ~~The proposed projects have an estimated cost of $50 million dollars. The USEPA will fund 55% and the Mexican government the remaining 45% of the total cost. The projects received conditional certification by the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) on December 5, 1997, and final certification as of January 7, 1998. In November 1999, the NAD Bank developed and submitted a financing plan for the projects to USEPA and the Mexican Government for approval. The plan was approved by both entities and includes Federal, State, and local funds to pay for project costs. Construction of the projects is underway, and should improve the overall quality of the New River, when properly operated and maintained. The construction of the WWTP has been delayed due to a law suit in Mexico, ,and construction is now expected to be completed in 2004. However, the existing lagoon systems and the proposed 20-mgd facility do not include disinfection.~~ In December 2003, the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) granted conditional certification for construction of the Mexicali II WWTP at a site known as "Las Arenitas," which is outside the Salton Sea Transboundary Watershed. Effluent from Las Arenitas is discharged to a tributary of the Rio Hardy in Mexico. In October 2006, Mexico completed installation of the 48-inch force main for Las Arenitas WWTP, the modifications to Pumping Plant No. 4 to meet the new pumping requirements for Las Arenitas, and construction of the Las Arenitas WWTP. The WWTP was fully functional in December 2008. The cost for this project was approximately 26 million dollars.

Las Arenitas WWTP was designed to prevent any remaining untreated municipal sewage in Mexicali from discharging into the New River. As a result of Las Arenitas, 15-20 million gallons per day of raw sewage routinely present in the New River at the International Boundary (U.S. and Mexico) have been eliminated. Regional Board staff and USIBWC staff will continue to monitor the New River monthly, participate in bi-national technical committee meetings to address New River pollution from Mexico, and participate in bi-national tours to assess and enhance water quality improvements. Regional Board monitoring data (Table 4.1) indicate a 10-fold reduction in New River bacteria, and a reduction in volatile organic compounds to levels below detection as a result of Las Arenitas. The dissolved oxygen in the River at the International Boundary has also improved dramatically, eliminating the stench that characterized the New River at this location. Furthermore, the improvements and new WWTP have reduced nutrient loading into the Salton Sea by about twenty percent. Water quality impairments still occur at the International Boundary due to trash, and various non-point source pollution, such as pesticides from agricultural runoff, and nutrients and pathogens from confined animal feeding operations and slaughterhouses in Mexicali. The tables below compare New River water quality at the International Boundary before and after completion of the bi-national projects, including Las Arenitas.

Table 4.1 Comparison of Monitoring Results Before and After Bi-National Projects

Issue	Pre Bi-national Projects	Post Bi-national Projects
Fecal, E. Coli	> 1,000,000 MPN	~ 100 – 60,000 MPN
Dissolved Oxygen	< 1.0 mg/L	~ 5.0 mg/L
Nutrients (PO4)	40% of Load to Salton Sea	20% of Load to Salton Sea
VOCs	Some detected	Non-detect
Trash	> 150 cu yds/year	> 150 cu yds/year
Pesticides	Detected	Still a problem

7. "**VII. PROHIBITIONS**", [page 4-46]

Delete section titled "**VII. PROHIBITIONS**" as shown below:

~~VII. PROHIBITIONS~~

~~A. IMPERIAL VALLEY SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION~~

~~A prohibition of sediment/silt discharge is hereby established for the Imperial Valley, including the Alamo River, New River, all Imperial Valley Drains, and their tributaries. Specifically, beginning three months after USEPA approval, the direct or indirect discharge of sediment into the Imperial Valley is prohibited, unless:~~

~~1. The Discharger is:~~

~~a. In compliance with applicable Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL(s), including implementation provisions (e.g., Discharger is in good standing with the ICFB Watershed Program or has a Drain Water Quality Monitoring Plan (DWQMP) approved by the Executive Officer); or~~

~~b. Has a monitoring and surveillance program approved by the Executive Officer that demonstrates that discharges of sediment/silt into the aforementioned waters do not violate or contribute to a violation of the TMDL(s), the anti-degradation policy (State Board Resolution No. 68-16), or water quality objectives; or~~

~~c. Is covered by Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) or a Waiver of WDRs that applies to the discharge.~~

~~TMDL compliance groups have formed to address issues regarding wastewater discharge from irrigated lands to waters of the state. Individual Dischargers are not required by the Regional Board to join in TMDL compliance groups. Individual~~

~~Dischargers who choose not to participate in TMDL compliance groups must file a Report of Waste Discharge for general or individual Waste Discharge Requirements. Compliance with the prohibition will be determined with respect to each individual Discharger, whether or not the Discharger is a member of a compliance group. The intent of this prohibition is to control to the degree practicable sediment/silt discharges from irrigated lands in amounts that violate or contribute to a violation of state water quality standards.~~

CHAPTER 5 - PLANS, POLICIES AND ISSUES

1. "**A. RESOLUTION No. 68-16**", [page 5-1]

   Include web address as shown below.

   "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California" (adopted October 28, 1968).
   http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/1968/rs68_016.pdf

2. "**B. WATER QUALITY CONTROL**", [page 5-1]

   Revise text and include web address as shown below.

   ~~"State Policy for Water Quality Control" (adopted July 6, 1972, by motion).~~
   "Water Quality Control Policy for Addressing Impaired Waters: Regulatory Structure and Options" (adopted June 15, 2005, Resolution No. 2005-0050).
   http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/docs/iw_policy.pdf

3. "**C. THERMAL PLAN**", [page 5-1]

   Include web address as shown below.

   "Water Quality Control Plan for Control of Temperature in the Coastal Interstate Waters and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California". (adopted on September 18, 1975, Resolution No. 75-89).
   http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/docs/wqplans/thermpln.pdf

4. "**D. POWER PLANT COOLING**", [page 5-1]

   Include web address as shown below.

   "Water Quality Control Policy on the Use and Disposal of Inland Waters Used for Powerplant Cooling" (adopted June 19, 1975; Resolution No. 75-58).
   http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/1975/rs75_058.pdf

5. "**E. WATER RECLAMATION**", [page 5-1]

   Include web address as shown below.

"Policy with Respect to Water Reclamation in California" (adopted January 6, 1977, Resolution No. 77-1).
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/1977/rs77_001.pdf

6. "**G. NON POINT SOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN**", [page 5-1]

Revise text and include web address as shown below.

G. NONPOINT SOURCE PROGRAM STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION ~~MANAGEMENT~~ PLAN

~~"Nonpoint Source Management Plan" (adopted November 15, 1988; Resolution No. 88-123).~~
Volume 1, Nonpoint Source Program Strategy and Implementation Plan, 1998-2013 (PROSIP) (adopted January 2000).
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/nps/docs/planvol1.doc"

7. "**H. SOURCES OF DRINKING WATER POLICY**", [page 5-1]

Include web address as shown below.

"Sources of Drinking Water" (adopted May 19, 1988; Resolution No. 88-63).
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/2006/rs2006_0008_rev_rs88_63.pdf

8. Add the following title and text immediately after "H. SOURCES OF DRINKING WATER POLICY", [page 5-1]

I. RECYCLED WATER POLICY

"Recycled Water Policy" (adopted February 3, 2009, Resolution No. 2009-0011).
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_recycling_policy/docs/recycledwaterpolicy_approved.pdf

9. "**A. SEWERAGE SYSTEMS**", [page 5-1]

Include web address as shown below.

"Guidelines Regarding Grouped or Community Sewerage Systems" (adopted January 28, 1981; Resolution No. 81-35).
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/publications_forms/publications/docs/commsew.pdf

10. "**B. SEWAGE DISPOSAL FROM LAND DEVELOPMENTS**", [page 5-1]

Include web address as shown below.

"Guidelines for Sewage Disposal from Land Developments" (adopted March 14, 1979; Resolution No. 79-42).
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/publications_forms/publications/docs/sewtoland.pdf

11. "**H. WAIVER FOR WASTE DISCHARGES**", [page 5-2]

Delete "H. WAIVER FOR WASTE DISCHARGES" as shown below.

~~"**H. WAIVER FOR WASTE DISCHARGES**"~~

~~"Waiving Waste Discharge Requirements for Specific Types of Discharges" (adopted March 31, 1993; Resolution No. 93-0004).~~